DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 127 TM 800 293

AUTHOR	Goodwin, Judy
TITLE	Follow Through Program (Original), 1978-1979. Report No. 8023.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Early Childhood Programs.
PUB DATE	Feb 80
NOTE	58p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Ancillary School Services; *Compensatory Education; Elementary School Mathematics; *Parent Participation; Participant Satisfaction; Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Reading Achievement; School Health Services; *Staff Development; Student Teacher Ratio; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS	California Achievement Tests; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

Philadelphia's Follow Through program in 14 schools was evaluated in terms of its educational, staff development, parent involvement, health services, and social services components. Cross-sectional reading and mathematics achievement data indicated that the Follow Through participants outperformed the non-Follow Through Title I group. Quasi-longitudinal achievement data were consistent with these findings, indicating that pupils with maximum exposure to Follow Through in grades 1-3 outperformed Title I non-Follow Through pupils, regardless of preschool experience. Classroom observation data indicated different behaviors were present in classrooms using the different Follow Through models: Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, Bilingual, Educational Development Center, Parent Implemented, and Philadelphia Process. Teachers and aides participated in staff development workshops and consultations; most felt that these activities had produced changes in the classroom. Parent involvement included fund raising, training, and providing policy and budget advice, at the approximate rate of 14.3 hours per family. Health services data showed that in fourteen schools, nine had contracts for supplemental medical services, five for dental services, and six for psychological services. All of the schools employed Parent Involvement Coordinators, who assisted almost half of the families needing social service assistance. (Staff questionnaires and data tables are included). (Author/GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189127

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM (ORIGINAL)
1978-1979

Report Prepared by:
Judy Goodwin
of the
Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report #8023

February, 1980

Irvin J. Farber
Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Kean

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director
Research and Evaluation

TM 800293

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

DISCLAIMER

The activity which is the subject of this report regarding the original, national Follow Through Program was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Tobyann Boonin

Mr. Joseph H. Previty

Mr. Samuel H. Rubin

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Nicholas Trolio

* * * * *

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Charles A. Highsmith, Deputy Superintendent

* * * * *

Mrs. Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Programs

* * * * *

Miss Constance E. Clayton
Associate Superintendent
Early Childhood Education

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Very Great Thanks are due:

Mrs. Cleo Figgures for the staff development data analysis

Mrs. Anne Lukshus for the observation data analysis

Ms. Barbara Holden for the health and social services data analysis

Mr. John McKinney for the parent involvement and quasi-longitudinal achievement data analyses.

Dr. Kenneth Prusso and Mr. Richard Maraschiello for technical assistance

and

Mrs. Betty Jackson and Mrs. Irene Goldner for typing this report

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through Program was evaluated in terms of its educational, staff development, parent involvement, health and social service components. Cross-sectional achievement data indicated that the Total Follow Through Program regularly outperformed the Title I Non-Follow Through group in both Reading and Math. Quasi-longitudinal achievement data was consistent with these findings, indicating that pupils with maximum exposure to Follow Through (Grades 1-3) outperformed Title I Non-Follow Through pupils in Reading and Math regardless of previous pre-school experience and low absence rates.

Classroom observation data revealed an average adult to child ratio of 1:12, and showed staff consistently working with small groups of children. Clear differences emerged in the degree of structure observed which were consistent with each model's philosophy, however, model-specific items were sometimes more predominant in a model other than the one for which the item was targeted.

Staff development data indicated that the majority of teachers and aides had attended a number of workshops and received numerous on-site consultations. Most were satisfied with services provided by support personnel and felt that staff development had produced "moderate" to "great" changes in the classroom. Priorities for future staff development were: i) learning disabilities, ii) improving the basic skills, iii) social behaviors, iv) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum and v) individualizing instruction.

Parent Involvement data showed that Policy Advisory Committees spent a substantial amount of time in planning fund-raising events, educational sessions

for parents and providing input for policy and budget decisions. The total number of hours donated to the program amounted to 33,989 hours which represented 14.3 hours per family.

Health data showed that 9 of 14 schools had contracts for supplemental medical services, 5 of 14 schools had contracts for supplemental dental services and 6 of 14 schools had contracts for supplemental psychological services.

Social Service data indicated that all 14 Follow Through schools were staffed with Parent Involvement Coordinators, who assisted 946 (48.8%[1]) families identified as needing help of a social service nature.

[1]Percentage based on total number of families in the program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1-2
PREVIOUS FINDINGS, 1977-1978.	2
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES, 1978-1979	3-4
CROSS-SECTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA.	5-10
QUASI-LONGITUDINAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA	11-13
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION DATA	14-16
STAFF DEVELOPMENT DATA	17-19
PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA	20
HEALTH AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DATA	21
SOCIAL SERVICES DATA	22
SUMMARY	23-24
APPENDICES	A - F

EVALUATION OF THE ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

1978-1979

INTRODUCTION

A. Program Description

The Original Follow Through Program is a nationwide attempt to provide unique educational settings for low-income students in Kindergarten through Grade 3. It emphasizes planned variation in instructional approach, intensive parent and community involvement in school functioning, and special supportive services. Six models are presently operating in Philadelphia: Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, Bilingual, Educational Development Center (EDC), Parent Implemented and Philadelphia Process. In 1977-1978, when Title I funding sources (which also support the original program in large measure in Philadelphia) decided to enforce strictly the educational deprivation criterion of that title--which is at variance with Follow Through Guidelines -- the many children who were scoring above the 50th percentile in Reading became ineligible for continued participation.

B. Evaluation Techniques

Through the use of instruments developed by the Follow Through Evaluation Unit, information was collected in the areas of classroom practices, staff development, parent involvement, social and health services. The Classroom Observation Routine (COR), the Staff Development Questionnaire, the Parent Involvement Questionnaire, and the Social Services Questionnaire were utilized

to gather the required data. Analysis was essentially of a descriptive nature focusing on percentage distributions within appropriate content categories. City-wide test data were also utilized for the analysis of pupil achievement. Mean score differences were analyzed employing Davis' formula for determining the standard error of measurement of the difference between means.

C. Previous Findings: 1977-1978

Cross-sectional achievement data indicated that strict enforcement of the Title I educational deprivation criterion seriously affected program performance. However, post-program analyses indicated that Bank Street graduates (grades 4-7) regularly outperformed Non-Follow Through pupils, and Behavior Analysis graduates also regularly surpassed the Non-Follow Through group, but only when there had been prior Head Start experience. Priority areas for future staff development were identified as "improving the basic skills," "learning disabilities" "social behaviors" "the creative arts" and "individualing instruction." Resource personnel also considered "parent involvement" a high priority.

Classroom observation data revealed that an average adult to child ratio of 1:12 and small group instruction were clearly in operation. Parent volunteer hours totaled 13,177 which represented 12.20 hours per family. Supplemental health services were provided to 11 of the 14 Follow Through schools and social services included 3,476 home visits.

D. Evaluation of Specific Objectives/1978-1979

1. In at least three of the six models in the original program, third grade pupils in Total Reading on the CAT in February, 1979 will have a smaller percentage scoring below the 50th percentile than the total third grade group in these same models in February, 1978.

This objective was fully attained. Four of the six models (Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, Bilingual, and EDC) had a smaller percentage below the 50th percentile in Total Reading this year in comparison with last.

In 1978-1979, two models, Bank Street and Parent Implemented, had 57 and 67%, respectively; two, EDC and Bilingual, had 70 and 76% respectively; and two, Philadelphia Process and Behavior Analysis, had 84 and 93% respectively.

2. In at least 2/3 of the original program schools there will be at least one hour of parent volunteer time monthly to match the number of children in the program and at least 50% of the program parents will attend one school meeting or affair during the school year.

This objective was not attained. The two criteria would have to have been met in at least 9 of the 14 original program schools to satisfy the objective. Only 5 schools had the required number of volunteer hours (only 3 had been reported earlier), and only 6 had the expected percentage of parents attending a meeting during the year.

Three schools had 216 - 296 volunteer hours; four had 890 - 1029 hours; three had 1168 - 1293; three had 1968 - 2519; and one had 9382. As regards attendance at one or more meetings, five had 15 - 33% of the parents in attendance; three had 42 - 45%; three had 50 - 64% and three had 72 - 90%.

3. In at least 2/3 of the schools in the original program, at least 60% of the pupils will receive medical screenings via School District Health Services, or agencies cooperating with the School District, and in those schools which have specially contracted medical services at least 75% of the children referred for care will receive treatment.

This objective was fully attained. In all 14 of the original program schools all K-3 children received medical screenings from School District Health Services and in the 9 schools with specially contracted medical services all children referred for care received treatment. It should also be noted that all children in Grades K, 1 and 3 also received dental screenings from School District Health Services.

IA CROSS-SECTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA

This section focuses on the performance of Follow Through pupils when compared with the performance of Title I eligible children in the city who were not in Follow Through Programs. Basic data tables for these comparisons across Grades 1-3 are found in Appendix A. Table 1 provides Reading data by grade, and Table 2 Mathematics data. Each table presents basic information for (1) each model within the Follow Through Program, (2) each Follow Through District grouping, i.e., districts which have more than one model (Districts 2, 4 and 5: D2F, D4F and D5F) (3) the Total Follow Through Program (TFT) and (4) each district grouping of non-Follow Through (NFT) Title I eligible children, and a Total City non-Follow Through (TNF) grouping. Performance information consists of (a) total number of children (Total N) for each grouping, (b) percentages of children scoring below the national 16th percentile (<16) and (c) percentages scoring at or above the national 50th percentile (>50). The data are restricted to Grades 1-3 because Title I identification was immediately available through computerized matching of 1978-1979 city-wide test tapes with 1977-1978 tapes. To include Kindergarten would have required manual matching of Fall SESAT Environment scores with mid-year test tapes.

In the following, reference will be made to Effectiveness Scores (ES). These are straightforward summary indicators allowing combined below 16th (<16) and above 50th (>50) performance to be applied across grades and subject matter areas. Effectiveness Scores (ES) are defined as: percentages in decimal form reflecting the ratio of actual to total possible occurrences of higher performance when comparing Follow Through and non-Follow Through

TABLE 1

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH, 1978-79

Effectiveness Scores (ES) For Reading And Mathematics Comparing Follow Through Performance With Non Follow Through (NFT) Performance (Districts 1-7: D1, 2 etc.)

MODEL	DISTRICT (NFT)	Reading (Grades 1-3)		Math (Grades 1-3)		Rdg. & Math (Grades 1-3)	
		Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES
Bank Street	D1	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	2	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	3	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	4	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	5	5/6	.83	3/6	.50	8/12	.67
	6	6/6	1.00	4/6	.67	10/12	.83
	7	6/6	1.00	5/6	.83	11/12	.92
	D2,5	10/12	.83	7/12	.58	17/24	.71
	TNF	6/6	1.00	4/6	.67	10/12	.83
Behavior Analysis	D1	0/6	.00	3/6	.50	3/12	.25
	2	1/6	.17	4/6	.67	5/12	.42
	3	3/6	.50	2/6	.33	5/12	.42
	4	0/6	.00	5/6	.83	5/12	.42
	5	2/6	.33	1/6	.17	3/12	.25
	6	2/6	.33	4/6	.67	6/12	.50
	7	2/6	.33	3/6	.50	5/12	.42
	D2,4	1/12	.08	3/12	.75	10/24	.42
	TNF	1/6	.17	3/6	.50	4/12	.33
Behavior Analysis (Nebinger)	D1	1/6	.17	6/6	1.00	7/12	.58
	2	1/6	.17	5/6	.83	6/12	.50
	3	2/6	.33	5/6	.83	7/12	.58
	4	1/6	.17	5/6	.83	6/12	.50
	5	0/6	.00	5/6	.83	5/12	.42
	6	2/6	.33	5/6	.83	7/12	.58
	7	2/6	.33	6/6	1.00	8/12	.67
	TNF	1/6	.17	5/6	.83	6/12	.50
Bilingual	D1	5/6	.83	6/6	.50	11/12	.92
	2	4/6	.67	6/6	.50	10/12	.83
	3	5/6	.83	5/6	.83	10/12	.83
	4	4/6	.67	6/6	1.00	10/12	.83
	5	6/6	1.00	5/6	.83	11/12	.92
	6	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	7	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	D2,5	10/12	.83	11/12	.92	21/24	.88
	TNF	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
EDC	D1	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	2	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	3	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	4	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	5	5/6	.83	5/6	.83	10/12	.83
	6	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	7	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	TNF	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
Parent Implemented	D1	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	2	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	3	3/6	.50	4/6	.67	7/12	.58
	4	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	5	3/6	.50	3/6	.50	6/12	.50
	6	4/6	.67	5/6	.83	9/12	.75
	7	4/6	.67	5/6	.83	9/12	.75
	TNF	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
Philadelphia Process	D1	4/6	.67	3/6	.50	7/12	.58
	2	4/6	.67	2/6	.33	6/12	.50
	3	4/6	.67	3/6	.50	7/12	.58
	4	5/6	.83	3/6	.50	8/12	.67
	5	4/6	.67	0/6	.00	4/12	.25
	6	5/6	.83	3/6	.50	8/12	.67
	7	4/6	.67	1/6	.17	5/12	.42
	TNF	5/6	.83	2/6	.33	7/12	.58

(NFT) groupings. A minimum of 4 percentage points difference was required for Follow Through groupings to be considered higher than NFT. Effectiveness Scores (ES) are listed in the text in Tables 1 and 2. For each Follow Through grouping in comparison with each NFT grouping there are provided three different ESs: (1) across grades 1-3 in Reading, (2) across grades 1-3 in Math and (3) across grades 1-3 in Reading and Math combined. Since the Bank Street, Behavior Analysis and Bilingual models are located in two districts, comparisons were also made with combined district performance, e.g., Bank Street was compared with Districts 2 and 5 combined. An example of an ES in the table is as follows: the first entry under Bank Street is a comparison with District 1 (D1) NFT in Reading across grades 1-3. Bank Street exceeded D1/NFT in 5 of 6 comparisons (i.e., with respect to below 16th and above 50th percentile performance for each of the three grades) thus yielding an ES of .83.

The findings are presented below in a question and answer format: the question is raised, the major finding is presented, followed by discussion of other relevant trends.

1. Did Follow Through pupil achievement compare favorably with the Total non-Follow Through Title I comparison group?

Results (in Table 2) indicated that the Total Follow Through program outperformed TNF in 5 of 6 comparisons in Reading, all 6 comparisons in Math and 11 of 12 comparisons in Reading and Math combined yielding ES's of .83, 1.00 and .92 respectively.

Follow Through District performance, i.e., those districts in which several models are located (D2F etc.), was compared with TNF performance

and can be found in Table 2. Results indicate that District 2 Follow Through (D2F) yielded ESs of .33 in Reading, .83 in Math, and .58 in Reading and Math combined. D4F had ESs of .33, .50 and .42 respectively, while D5F yielded ESs of 1.00 in every area. District five Follow Through performance proved to be consistently superior to TNF performance

2. Did each model compare favorably with the non-Follow Through Title I comparison groups?

With the exception of the Behavior Analysis model, each model outperformed TNF in either Reading or Math. The Behavior Analysis model which was the most successful model in Philadelphia until the 1977 Title I ruling has shown a marked decline in performance. However, all of the models outperformed TNF in either Reading or Math when compared with their combined District groupings.

Bank Street outperformed TNF in all 6 comparisons in Reading, 4 out of 6 comparisons in Math and 10 of 12 comparisons in Reading and Math combined yielding ESs of 1.00, .67 and .83 respectively. When compared with its combined Districts (D2 and D5) ESs were .83 in Reading, .58 in Math and .71 in Reading and Math combined.

Behavior Analysis (BA) yielded ESs of .17 in Reading, .50 in Math and .33 in Reading and Math when compared with TNF. When compared with its combined Districts (D2 and D4) ESs were .08 in Reading, .75 in Math and .42 in Reading and Math combined. Behavior Analysis (Nebinger) yielded ESs of .17, .83 and .50 respectively.

[1]Behavior Analysis (Nebinger) however, did outperform the TNF in Math, and is treated as distinct from the BA model since it has only recently adopted the BA approach.

TABLE 2

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH 1978-79

Effectiveness Scores (ES) For Reading And Mathematics Comparing Follow Through District Performance (D2F etc.) With Non Follow Through (NFT) Performance (Districts 1-7: D1, 2 etc.)

FT DISTRICT GROUPINGS	DISTRICT (NFT)	Reading (Grades 1-3)		Math (Grades 1-3)		Rdg. & Math (Grades 1-3)	
		Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES
D2F	D1	3/6	.50	4/6	.67	7/12	.58
	2	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	3	3/6	.50	4/6	.67	7/12	.58
	4	2/6	.33	4/6	.67	6/12	.50
	5	3/6	.50	2/6	.33	5/12	.42
	6	3/6	.50	6/6	1.00	9/12	.75
	7	2/6	.33	4/6	.67	6/12	.50
	TNF	2/6	.33	5/6	.83	7/12	.58
D4F	D1	2/6	.33	3/6	.50	5/12	.42
	2	1/6	.17	3/6	.50	4/12	.25
	3	2/6	.33	2/6	.33	4/12	.25
	4	1/6	.17	4/6	.67	5/12	.42
	5	2/6	.33	2/6	.33	4/12	.25
	6	2/6	.33	4/6	.67	6/12	.50
	7	2/6	.33	3/6	.50	5/12	.42
	TNF	2/6	.33	3/6	.50	5/12	.42
D5F	D1	6/6	1.00	5/6	.83	11/12	.92
	2	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	3	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	4	5/6	.83	5/6	.83	10/12	.83
	5	5/6	.83	5/6	.83	10/12	.83
	6	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
	7	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
	TNF	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
TFT	D1	5/6	.83	5/6	.83	10/12	.83
	2	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	3	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	4	5/6	.83	5/6	.83	10/12	.83
	5	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	6	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
	7	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	TNF	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92

The Bilingual model outperformed TNF with ESs of .83, 1.00 and .92 in Reading, Math, and Reading and Math combined. Compared with its combined districts (D2 and D5) ESs were .83 in Reading, .92 in Math and .88 in Reading and Math combined.

EDC outperformed TNF with ESs of .83 in Reading, 1.00 in Math and .92 in Reading and Math combined, while Parent Implemented yielded ESs of .50, .83 and .67 and Philadelphia Process .83, .33 and .58 respectively.

3. Which models had the most positive effect on pupil achievement?

When both Reading and Math performance were taken into account, the Bilingual and EDC models tied for first place with ESs of .92. Bank Street was the next highest performing model with an ES of .83. In Reading, Bank Street had the most positive effect on pupil achievement with an ES of 1.00, followed by Bilingual, EDC and Philadelphia Process with ESs of .83. In Math, Bilingual and EDC had the most positive effect on pupil achievement with ESs of 1.00, followed by Parent Implemented and BA (Nebinger) with ESs of .83.

4. How did Follow Through performance in 1978-1979 compare with 1977-1978 Follow Through performance?

Follow Through performance in 1978-1979 was consistently better than 1977-1978 performance with ESs of 1.00 in Reading, .83 in Math and .92 in Reading and Math combined[1]. With the exception of Philadelphia Process and D4F, every model and District Follow Through grouping consistently outdid its previous year's performance in Reading and Math.

[1]A two percentage point difference was considered significant in comparing within program groups.

IB QUASI-LONGITUDINAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Effectiveness scores were also calculated for those pupils who have had: (1) maximum exposure to the Follow Through Program, i.e., Grade 1-one year, Grade 2-two years, Grade 3-three years. This group is designated THNH (Total Head Start/Non-Head Start) in Table 3 of the text, (2) maximum exposure and less than 16 days absent, (3) maximum exposure and previous Head Start (or equivalent pre-school experience), designated GHSE (General Head Start Experience) in Table 3, (4) maximum exposure, pre-school experience and less 16 days absent. A comprehensive treatment of these results can be found in McKinney, J. Quasi-Longitudinal Analysis: Follow Through Pupil Achievement Characteristics in Philadelphia; 1978-1979, Report

The following discussion compares THNH and GHSE groups with the Total Title I Non-Follow Through (TNF) group. It should be noted that only those comparisons where the number of pupils was at least 20 were included in the analysis.

Did maximum exposure to the program and/or previous pre-school experience and/or low absence rates (0-15 days) have a positive effect on pupil achievement?

Pupils with maximum exposure to Follow Through consistently outperformed NFT pupils in Reading and Math (ESs of 1.00) regardless of whether they had less than 16 days absent or previous pre-school experience. In grades 4-9, post program analyses indicated that pupils in the Parent Implemented, EDC and Behavior Analysis models, who had previous Head Start experience and/or low absence rates (0-15 days) outperformed Non-Follow Through pupils in Reading or Math.

TABLE 3

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH, 1978-1979
QUASI-LONGITUDINAL DATA

Effectiveness Scores (ES) For Reading and Mathematics Comparing Follow Through Performance Dimensioned By Maximum Program Exposure (including Pre-school Experience) and Absence Data (0-15 days) with Total Non-Follow Through Title I Performance.

Program Exposure/ Absence	Model	Reading (Grades 1-3)		Math (Grades 1-3)		Rdg. and Math (Grades 1-3)	
		Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES
THNH[1]	Bank Street	4/4	1.00	4/4	1.00	8/8	1.00
	Behavior Analysis	1/4	.25	2/4	.50	3/8	.38
	Bilingual	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
	Educational Development Center	4/4	1.00	4/4	1.00	8/8	1.00
	Parent Implemented	1/2	.50	1/2	.50	2/4	.50
	Philadelphia Process	5/6	.83	3/6	.50	8/12	.67
	TOTAL FOLLOW THROUGH	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
THNH 0-15 days	Bank Street	2/2	1.00			2/2	1.00
	Behavior Analysis			2/2	1.00	2/4	.50
	Bilingual	4/4	1.00	4/4	1.00	8/8	1.00
	Educational Development Center	4/4	1.00	4/4	1.00	8/8	1.00
	Parent Implemented[3]						
	Philadelphia Process	5/6	.83	4/6	.67	9/12	.75
	TOTAL FOLLOW THROUGH	6/6	1.00	5/6	.83	11/12	.92
GHSE[2]	Bank Street[3]						
	Behavior Analysis[3]						
	Bilingual[3]						
	Educational Development Center	2/2	1.00	2/2	1.00	4/4	1.00
	Parent Implemented[3]						
	Philadelphia Process	4/4	1.00	2/4	.50	6/8	.75
	TOTAL FOLLOW THROUGH	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00
GHSE 0-15 days	Bank Street[3]						
	Behavior Analysis[3]						
	Bilingual[3]						
	Educational Development Center[3]						
	Parent Implemented[3]						
	Philadelphia Process	4/4	1.00	2/4	.50	6/8	.75
	TOTAL FOLLOW THROUGH	6/6	1.00	6/6	1.00	12/12	1.00

1. Total Head Start and Non-Head Start Group with Maximum Exposure.
2. Total Head Start (or Equivalent Pre-School Experience) with Maximum Exposure.
3. Insufficient N's.

THNH (pupils with maximum exposure) outperformed TNF in Reading, Math and Reading and Math combined with ESs of 1.00 respectively. In Reading, Bank Street, Bilingual, EDC and Philadelphia Process outperformed TNF with ESs of 1.00, 1.00, 1.00 and .83 respectively. In Math, Bank Street, Bilingual and EDC had ESs of 1.00.

When the number of days absent was taken into account (0-15 days), THNH exceeded TNF with ESs of 1.00 in Reading, .83 in Math and .92 in Reading and Math combined. In Reading[1], all of the models, with the exception of Behavior Analysis, outperformed TNF with ESs ranging from .83 to 1.00. In Math[1], all the models exceeded TNF with ESs ranging from .83 to 1.00.

GHSE (pupils with maximum exposure and pre-school experience) outperformed TNF with ESs of 1.00 in Reading, 1.00 in Math and 1.00 in Reading and Math combined. EDC and Philadelphia Process (the only models with sufficient N's for analysis) had ESs of 1.00 in Reading, and 1.00 and .75 respectively in Math.

When the number of days absent was taken into account (0-15 days), GHSE exceeded TNF in Reading and Math with ESs of 1.00 respectively. Philadelphia Process (the only model with sufficient N's for analysis) outperformed TNF in Reading (but not in Math) with an ES of 1.00.

[1]There were insufficient N's to include Parent Implemented in the analysis

II CLASSROOM OBSERVATION DATA (See Appendix B)

Classroom observations utilizing the Classroom Observation Routine (COR) developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit were conducted in every program classroom, with the exception of those which were staffed by teachers new to the program in 1978-1979. It should be pointed out that several revisions were made to the COR, and that greater emphasis was placed on model-specific features; the essential approach and many items were retained, however.

As can be seen from Table B-1, the average adult to child ratio was approximately 1:12. All classrooms were staffed with aides, but only Behavior Analysis (BA) and Parent Implemented (PI) classrooms were regularly staffed with parent scholars. Since there were inconsistencies in the observation data collected in the Parent Implemented Model due to one hired observer, and since the model is represented by one school only, it was decided that the data should not be utilized. The following evaluation questions were addressed:

1. Was small group instruction evident in program classrooms?

STAFF LOCATION information consistently showed staff working with small groups of children, and aides and parent scholars were observed instructing in 77% to 100% of the observations. Both small group instruction and the full utilization of paraprofessionals in the instructional program are goals of the program that appear to have been fully met. During the observations Reading or the Language Arts tended to be the predominant subject matter being taught, probably because of the time of day when observations were conducted.

2. Were there observable differences that distinguished one model from another?

Yes, although the differences were often a matter of degree than kind. In some cases, model-specific items were observed more frequently in a model other than the one for which the item was designed. However, clear differences emerged in the degree of structure observed and these are consistent with each model's philosophy.[1]

MODEL-SPECIFIC ITEMS relating to materials and classroom organization revealed that LIBRARY CENTERS existed in some classrooms across ALL models, although they were predominant in the Philadelphia Process Model (PP) which stresses this item. ACTIVITY CENTERS appear to exist across all models, although stressed in EDC and PP. CHILD-MADE CHARTS AND GRAPHS, an item specific to the Philadelphia Process Model, were observed in 25% of the PP observations, but were even more frequently observed (36%) in BI. CHILD-MADE ART WORK, was lowest in PP (33% of the observations), and highest in BA (89% of the observations). SAPA[2] KITS an item specific to PP, were observed in 42% of the observations made in that model.

ATTENDANCE BOARDS, CHOICE BOARDS AND JOB CHARTS were items specifically included for BS, CHOICE BOARDS, however, were in evidence in only 17% of the BS observations, but appeared in 25% of the EDC observations. TOKEN MENUS AND PROGRAMMED WORKBOOKS, items specific to the Behavior Analysis Model, were evident in 78% and 89% of the observations respectively in this model. ETHNIC MATERIALS, an item particularly stressed in BI, were observed in 50% of the BI observations, and were also evident in EDC (44%) and BS (33%) classrooms. ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, an item specific to BS, were NOT in evidence in this model, but appeared in 44% of the EDC observations. DIARIES, also a BS item, were evident in 33% of the BS observations, and in 13% of

[1]A total of 57 observations were conducted.

[2]Science a Process Approach

the EDC observations. A ROTATING SPANISH INSTRUCTOR also visited 5 of the 14 BI classes observed, on a daily basis.

TEACHER VERBAL INTERACTION appears to focus across ALL models on organizational and questioning moves, with the addition of a high number of approvals and rewards in BA. However, the intensity of teacher verbal interaction varied from model to model -- BA and BI were relatively high, EDC and PP in the medium range and BS relatively low. CHILD RESPONSES to teacher questions tended to follow a similar pattern, but CHILDREN TALKING TO OTHER CHILDREN followed an inverse pattern with BS highest in this regard and BA lowest.

CHILDREN READING occurred in 89% of the BA observations, 50% of BS and PP observations and 44% to 43% in EDC and BI respectively. CHILDREN WRITING AN ORIGINAL PIECE occurred in ONLY the EDC Model across 6% of the observations. CHILDREN MEASURING OR COMPARING occurred in PP across 25% of the observations, OBSERVING EVENTS OR OBJECTS 33% in BS and 43% in BI, CLASSIFYING 36% in BI, 25% in EDC and 17% in PP, APPLYING NUMBERS 25% in PP, ADDING, SUBTRACTING ETC. 21% in BI, 13% in EDC and 8% in PP and RESPONDING TO IF, HOW , WHY AND CONDITIONAL QUESTIONS 67% in BA, 58% in PP, 36% in BI and 6% in EDC.

III STAFF DEVELOPMENT DATA (See Appendix C)

The following analysis is based upon responses from 63 teachers (69%) and 53 (58%) aides. Four of six supervisors (District Liaison Assistants) also returned questionnaires.

1. How frequently did teachers and aides receive staff development (in the form of workshops, meetings, on-site consultations, demonstrations, etc.)?

The majority of teachers and aides indicated that they had attended at least 6 staff development WORKSHOPS during the year while 38% of the staff had attended over 10 workshops, most of which were provided by the Follow Through Program. In addition, the majority of the staff received at least 1 to 5 CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS, while 36% received over 6. However, 27% of the teachers reported receiving no classroom demonstrations, particularly in the Behavior Analysis (6 of 15 teachers) and EDC (7 of 17 teachers) models. ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS in the form of meetings, individual conferences, informal and formal communications were numerous but individual conferences tended to be the predominant mode of contact.

2. How satisfied were teachers and aides with the services provided by resource personnel?

Sixty-five to 88% of the teachers indicated satisfaction with all of the services (listed on questionnaire - see page C-2) provided by resource personnel as did an even greater percentage of the aides. Nineteen percent of the teachers were generally not satisfied with support in "parent involvement" and "solving classroom management problems."

Specific model analysis indicated that more than 25% of the Behavior

Analysis teachers were not satisfied with the following services: 1) on-site classroom training, support given to ii) individual concerns, iii) parent involvement iv) concern about individual children and v) classroom management problems. More than 25% of the EDC teachers were also not satisfied with the following services: 1) information regarding program decisions and procedures, ii) support in parent involvement, iii) suggestions about the effective use of curriculum materials and iv) classroom management problems.

3. What effect did staff development have on classroom practices?

With the exception of staff development in the area of "suspected child abuse and neglect" which is not emphasized in the staff development program, the majority of teachers and aides felt that staff development in all areas (see Appendix - page C-2) made a "moderate" to "great" change in their classroom performance. Staff development for teachers in the areas of "small group instruction", "individualizing instruction" and "making effective use of physical space" appear to have been particularly effective. For aides, staff development in "small group instruction", "improving the basic skills" and "social behaviors" appear to have been particularly effective.

Specific model analysis revealed, however, that more than 25% of the teachers in the Behavior Analysis model experienced little change from staff development in 10 of the 18 areas (see page C-2). The same held true for EDC (9 areas), Bank Street (8 areas) and Bilingual (7 areas).

4. What were the instructional staff's priorities for future staff development?

The five priority areas for both teachers and aides were:

i) learning disabilities (teachers 49%; aides 43%)
ii) improving the basic skills (teachers 48%; aides 49%)
iii) social behaviors (teachers 48%; aides 40%)
iv) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum (teachers 43%; aides 45%)
and v) individualizing instruction (teachers 41%; aides 43%)

Generally less than one third of the staff indicated a willingness to participate after school hours in staff development without reimbursement.

The District Liaison Assistants (DLA's) indicated quite a spread in their priorities for future staff development - the only areas not checked were "curriculum management" and "selecting and using commercial materials." Two of the 4 DLA's agreed that "assessing child growth and development," "learning disabilities" and "integration" should be priorities for future staff development.

IV PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA (See Appendix D)

Each Follow Through site continues to have its own Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and the following questions attempt to outline the level of parent involvement in the program for the 1978-1979 year.

1. What were the main functions of the parent group?

A substantial amount of time was spent on planning fund-raising events (2.64)[1], educational sessions for parents (2.50) and providing input for policy and budget decisions (2.50). As noted in the previous year's report, Follow Through parent groups have more input in this latter regard than most parent groups in other early childhood programs in the school district. PAC also spent a moderate amount of time planning social activities as well as extra-curricular activities for the children. Ten of the 14 sites indicated that PAC was also working with community groups in the neighborhood.

2. What was the level of parent involvement in terms of volunteer hours and workshop attendance?

The total number of hours donated to the program by parents amounted to 33,989[2] which represented 14.3 hours per family. The majority of these hours were spent in classroom participation. Nine thousand nine hundred and eighty-one hours were contributed to attendance at parent workshops which averaged approximately 17 per site during the school year.

[1]Values of 1, 2 and 3 were assigned to the following categories respectively: "little or none" = 1; "moderate" = 2; "a great deal" = 3.

[2]This number reflects workshop hours as well as the other activities listed in Table D-2.

V HEALTH AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES DATA (See Appendix E)

The Follow Through Program supplements health and psychological services provided by the local school district to ensure that identified medical, dental and mental health problems are treated. To this end:

i) 9 of 14 schools contracted for additional medical services

ii) 5 of 14 schools contracted for additional dental services

and iii) 6 of 14 schools contracted for additional mental health services.

1. What kinds of medical/dental screenings were provided?

   Based on data provided by the Division of School Health Services[1], 715 (27%) of the children had physical examinations, 1662 (63%) had vision screenings, 1487 (56%) had hearing screenings and 1333 (50%) had growth screenings. Dental screenings were also given to 1781 (67%) children. Mental health data provided by the contracted agencies indicated that approximately 106 children were either screened or observed.

2. What kind of follow-up care was provided?

   Of the 232 medical problems identified, 122 (55%) were either "under care" or care was completed. Of the 259 vision problems identified 89 (44%) were under care or care was completed, of the 69 hearing problems, 32 (48%) were either under care or care was completed, and of the 111 growth problems 54 (66%) were either under care or care was completed. Dental information indicated that 162 children were under treatment or had been treated for dental problems, while mental health information showed that 26 children were in therapy or counseling.

[1] Information regarding the number of children serviced by contracted agencies for medical care was not available.

VI SOCIAL SERVICES DATA (See Appendix F)

Social services in the 14 Follow Through schools were provided by 14 Parent Involvement Coordinators (PICs).

What was the level of social services in the program?

Approximately 50% (1,115) of the families in the program were identified as needing social service assistance. Of this number, 946 (85%) received assistance.

A total of 19,926 contacts were made by the PICs for the 1978-1979 year. The majority of their time (53.4%) was spent in contacts with families - a major goal of the program. The remaining amount of time was spent in contacts with community agencies, program staff and other activities. Contacts were primarily made for child attendance, adjustment problems (25.5%); child's physical and mental health (25.4%) and to share program information with families (20.2%), as well as information about community resources (6%).

SUMMARY

Cross-sectional achievement data indicated that the Total Follow Through Program outperformed the Title I Non-Follow Through (TNF) group in both Reading and Math. District 5 Follow Through performance proved to be consistently superior to TNF performance. When both Reading and Math performance were taken into account, the Bilingual and EDC models tied for first place and the Bank Street model was the next highest performing model. The Behavior Analysis model seems to have suffered the most as a result of the Title I ruling. 1978-1979 Follow Through performance proved to be consistently superior to 1977-1978 performance in both Reading and Math.

Quasi-longitudinal achievement data showed that pupils with maximum exposure to Follow Through consistently outperformed Title I Non-Follow Through pupils in Reading and Math regardless of whether they had previous pre-school experience or low absence rates (0-15 days). Post program analyses of pupils in grades 4-9 indicated that pupils in the Parent Implemented, EDC and Behavior Analysis models who had previous Head Start or equivalent experience and/or low absence rate outperformed Non-Follow Through pupils in Reading and Math.

Classroom observation data revealed that the average adult to child ratio was approximately 1:12 and consistently showed staff working with small groups of children. Both small group instruction and the full utilization of paraprofessionals for instructional purposes are goals of the program that appear to have been fully met. Clear differences emerged in the degree of structure observed which were consistent with each model's philosophy. Model-specific items, however, were sometimes observed more frequently in a model other than the one for which the item was originally intended.

Staff development data showed that the majority of teachers and aides attended at least 6 workshops, received 1-5 classroom demonstrations and numerous on-site consultations during the year. Most were satisfied with the services provided by support personnel and generally felt that staff development had produced "moderate" to "great" changes in the classroom. However, more EDC and Behavior Analysis teachers appeared to be dissatisfied with staff development services in general than teachers in the other models. Priorities for future staff development were: i) learning disabilities, ii) improving the basic skills, iii) social behaviors, iv) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum and v) individualizing instruction.

Parent involvement data indicated that Policy Advisory Committees spent a substantial amount of time in planning fund-raising events, educational sessions for parents and providing input for policy and budget decisions. The total number of hours donated to the program by parents amounted to 33,989 hours which represented 14.3 hours per family. The majority of these hours were spent in classroom participation.

Health data showed that 9 of 14 schools had contracts for supplemental medical services, 5 of 14 schools had contracts for supplemental dental services and 6 of 14 schools had contracts for supplemental psychological services. The majority of the children in the program were screened for both health and dental problems.

Social services data indicated that all 14 Follow Through schools were staffed with a Parent Involvement Coordinator (PIC) who provided social services. Eighty-five percent (946) of the families identified as needing help of a social service nature received assistance. A total of 19,926 contacts were made by the PICs, the majority of which were spent in contacts with families - a goal of the program.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1A

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM: 1977-1978 AND 1978-1979
READING

Percentages of Children Scoring At or Above the 50th Percentile and Below the 16th Percentile: Comparisons Between Follow Through (FT) Performance and Title I Non-Follow Through (NFT) Performance, Grades 1 - 3, California Achievement Test (CAT).

ORIGINAL PROGRAM	GRADE 1						GRADE 2						GRADE 3					
	Total N		>50		<16		Total N		>50		<16		Total N		>50		<16	
	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79
Bank Street	43	59	28	44	16	12	52	37	38	51	21	8	36	49	6	43	39	16
Behavior Analysis	136	104	51	45	9	13	117	134	29	32	23	20	106	132	1	7	72	51
Behavior Analysis (Nebinger)	—	36	—	22	—	22	—	37	—	19	—	11	—	37	—	8	—	43
Bilingual	110	65	38	63	24	12	101	106	34	41	22	19	99	119	20	24	45	16
EDC	103	123	55	65	17	6	95	102	42	40	23	19	93	111	2	30	58	14
Parent Implemented	5	28	0	61	80	21	36	23	8	30	44	26	18	36	44	33	11	6
Philadelphia Process	105	117	48	45	9	17	128	122	47	52	14	10	62	106	23	16	29	32
District 2 FT	115	97	37	42	20	16	87	116	23	34	28	20	93	101	0	15	85	28
District 4 FT	104	74	55	53	9	11	96	92	31	27	21	24	74	112	1	5	72	53
District 5 FT	75	85	33	60	23	12	123	92	33	52	26	12	92	123	33	40	5	7
TOTAL FT	502	552	46	51	15	13	529	561	36	40	22	16	414	590	11	21	50	27
TITLE I NON-FOLLOW THROUGH COMPARISONS																		
District 1 (NFT)	357	284	44	44	16	16	501	367	34	29	19	20	397	433	11	7	43	41
District 2 (NFT)	247	200	40	39	11	11	247	245	26	30	21	20	202	213	11	8	50	35
District 3 (NFT)	31	26	32	42	20	23	53	40	35	50	20	23	15	47	16	2	63	36
District 4 (NFT)	286	250	60	45	7	13	213	210	27	31	23	22	277	228	16	10	34	36
District 5 (NFT)	131	89	32	33	18	18	148	114	24	33	23	11	128	121	17	11	31	36
District 6 (NFT)	122	71	31	35	25	27	155	171	32	34	20	20	117	147	17	16	33	44
District 7 (NFT)	114	89	29	27	25	27	193	124	30	33	27	20	118	132	21	17	31	26
TOTAL NON-FOLLOW THROUGH (NFT)	1288	1009	43	40	15	16	1510	1271	30	32	21	20	1254	1321	14	10	39	37

A-1

TABLE 2A

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM: 1977-1978 and 1978-1979
MATHEMATICS

Percentages of Children Scoring At or Above the 50th Percentile and Below the 16th Percentile: Comparisons Between Follow Through (FT) Performance and Title I Non-Follow Through (NFT) Performance, Grades 1 - 3, California Achievement Test (CAT).

ORIGINAL PROGRAM	GRADE 1						GRADE 2						GRADE 3					
	Total N		>50		<16		Total N		>50		<16		Total N		>50		<16	
	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79
Bank Street	42	59	36	44	19	17	51	37	45	49	10	16	37	51	14	63	24	16
Behavior Analysis	136	101	57	49	12	10	118	137	34	45	17	15	105	137	10	21	53	43
Behavior Analysis (Nebinger)	--	36	--	42	--	8	--	37	--	46	--	0	--	38	--	45	--	8
Bilingual	108	59	54	81	9	5	107	103	45	51	11	13	97	119	34	41	28	11
EDC	99	119	64	77	14	6	95	102	38	47	15	13	93	113	11	56	43	13
Parent Implemented	6	27	0	63	50	22	37	23	35	43	24	13	18	36	61	67	0	11
Philadelphia Process	105	112	37	35	17	21	127	120	41	44	15	17	62	108	37	26	29	24
District 2 FT	113	97	50	53	16	14	95	115	42	42	14	17	92	103	7	34	53	19
District 4 FT	104	70	69	56	7	7	96	95	34	43	17	17	73	116	11	22	48	44
District 5 FT	75	79	31	63	16	13	122	90	42	60	14	9	92	124	49	59	9	10
TOTAL FT	496	513	51	56	14	12	535	559	40	47	15	14	412	602	22	40	36	21
TITLE I NON-FOLLOW THROUGH COMPARISONS																		
District 1 (NFT)	355	290	44	37	16	15	410	369	34	28	19	18	402	434	11	20	43	35
District 2 (NFT)	257	208	40	41	11	20	182	246	26	38	21	20	189	217	10	25	50	32
District 3 (NFT)	31	24	32	33	19	38	46	40	35	48	20	13	19	45	16	22	63	29
District 4 (NFT)	286	261	60	40	7	15	171	209	27	29	23	19	233	228	16	18	34	32
District 5 (NFT)	127	91	32	48	18	16	87	113	24	43	23	12	89	125	17	23	31	21
District 6 (NFT)	121	74	31	42	25	20	110	178	32	30	20	24	150	147	17	24	33	31
District 7 (NFT)	121	81	29	35	25	22	131	125	30	34	27	17	126	133	21	33	31	24
TOTAL NON-FOLLOW THROUGH (NFT)	1298	1029	43	40	15	18	1137	1280	30	33	21	18	1208	1329	14	23	39	31

A-2

APPENDIX B

MODELS	BS	BA	BI	EDC	PP
STAFF					
% of time present					
Teacher	100	100	100	100	100
Aide	100	77	92	87	91
Parent Scholar	0	44	14	0	0
ASSISTANCE	Aide PS	Aide PS	Aide PS	Aide PS	Aide PS
% of class assisted when instructing	32 -	34 34	32 29	24 -	20 -
Average # of pupils instructed	7 -	8 8	7 6	6 -	4 -
% of time spent instructing when present	83 -	100 100	77 100	100 -	100 -
SUBJECT MATTER					
(predominant)	Reading Social Studies	Reading	Language Arts Reading Bilingual	Reading Language Arts	Reading Math
LOCATION (Group Type)	N=6	N=9	N=14	N=16	N=12
Teacher	Small 50% Whole 33% Large 17%	Small 100%	Small 43% Whole 29% Large 21% Individual 7%	Small 69% Whole 19% Large 12%	Large 33% Small 33% Whole 25% Individual 8%
	N=6	N=7	N=13	N=14	N=11
Aide (when present)	Small 67% Large 17% Other 17%	Small 86% Large 14%	Small 62% Large 15% Whole 8% Other 15%	Small 71% Large 14% Individual 14%	Small 91% Individual 9%
	N=0	N=4	N=2	N=0	N=0
Parent Scholar (when present)		Small 75% Large 25%	Small 100%		
MATERIALS		PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS			
Library Center	33	22	29	31	75
2+Activity Centers	50	56	64	88	75
Child-made charts graphs	17	0	36	19	25
Child-made art work	83	89	64	69	33
SAPA kits	0	0	0	0	42
Attendance board	50	0	0	6	17
Choice board	17	0	0	25	0
Job chart	83	11	29	38	0
Token menu	0	78	0	0	8
Programmed workbooks	0	89	7	13	50
Games	67	78	100	88	83
Ethnic materials	33	11	50	44	8
Environmental projects	0	0	7	44	0
Dairies	33	0	7	13	8
TEACHER		AVERAGE FREQUENCY PER OBSERVATION			
Read	.6	.1	1.2	4.8	1.1
Organized	17	46	41	29	29
Questioned	16	44	36	29	25
Gave information	5	4	17	8	6.2
Approved	2	30	7	6	3
Praised (specific)	.1	6	2	1	1
Rewarded	0	41	1	0	0
Commented on behavior	4	11	2	3	2
CHILDREN					
Responded to teacher questions	18	68	53	31	23
		PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS			
Wrote an original piece	0	0	0	6	0
Read silently or aloud	50	89	43	44	50
Measured or compared	0	0	7	0	25
Observed events or objects	33	0	43	6	0
Classified	0	0	36	25	17
Applied numbers	0	0	0	0	25
Add, subtract, multiply, divide	0	0	21	13	8
Responded to IF, HOW, WHY, CONDITIONAL questions	0	67	36	6	58
Talked to other children (approved)	50	0	7	13	33

APPENDIX C

EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT
STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) LOG NUMBER

OFFICE USE ONLY

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH TEACHER (N=63)

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to continue documentation of the types, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of various staff development sessions across several early childhood programs.

The intent is to determine the range and extent of staff development available through the combined efforts of all personnel responsible for staff development (such as supervisory, resource, and support personnel) in each program.

Staff Development is considered to consist of all activities which lead to professional growth, including workshops, consultations, conferences, on-site visitations, meetings, newsletters, demonstrations, and informal discussions.

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number following each question. You may enter comments on page 4. Items numbered 2 and 3 will be precoded for your convenience.

We very much appreciate the time you are spending in completing this information.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2	PROGRAM	
	ACADEMICS PLUS	1
	BARC	2
	BRIDGE	3
	CHECKPOINT	4
	CHILD CARE	5
	DURHAM INFANT TODDLER	6
	FOLLOW THROUGH	7
	FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION	8
	GET SET DAY CARE	9
	PRESCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT (BROWN)	10
	PRE-K HEAD START	11
	PARENT CO-OP NURSERIES	12
	POWELTON MANTUA PROGRAM	13
	PRIMARY SKILLS	14
	REGULAR KINDERGARTEN	15

3	MODEL/OPTION UTILIZED IN YOUR SCHOOL/CENTER	
	BANK STREET	1
	BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS	2
	BILINGUAL BICULTURAL	3
	EDC	4
	MONTESSORI	5
	OPEN CLASSROOM	6
	PARENT IMPLEMENTED	7
	PHILADELPHIA PROCESS	8
	RESPONSIVE LEARNING	9
	OPTION 1 EXPANSION	10
	OPTION 2 EXPANSION	11
	OPTION 4 EXPANSION	12
	OPTION 5 EXPANSION	13
	OPTION 1 PRIMARY SKILLS	14
	OPTION 4 PRIMARY SKILLS	15
	NOT APPLICABLE	16

4	COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW MUCH EARLY CHILDHOOD (PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 4) CLASSROOM OR CENTER EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD?		%
	0 - 4 MONTHS	1	0
	5 - 8 MONTHS	2	0
	1 - 2 YEARS	3	3
	3 - 5 YEARS	4	5
	6 -10 YEARS	5	40
	OVER 10 YEARS	6	52

5	COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WITH YOUR PRESENT PROGRAM?		%
	0 - 4 MONTHS	1	6
	5 - 8 MONTHS	2	8
	1 - 2 YEARS	3	2
	3 - 5 YEARS	4	13
	6 -10 YEARS	5	60
	OVER 10 YEARS	6	10

6	INDICATE YOUR PRESENT POSITION:				
	TEACHER	1			
	ASSISTANT TEACHER	2			
	AIDE	3			

	WORKSHOPS (i.e., FORMAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT SESSIONS)	1-5 %	6-10 %	OVER 10 %	NONE %
7	HOW MANY WORKSHOPS HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS YEAR?	29	21	37	11
8	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY YOUR PROGRAM?	30	13	37	14
9	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT?	43	10	10	25

	CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATION	1-5	6-10	OVER 10	NONE
10	HOW MANY CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS HAVE YOU HAD THIS YEAR?	32	19	17	27

	ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS	1-15	16-30	OVER 30	NONE
11	GROUP MEETINGS	62	14	10	6
12	INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES	52	24	13	3
13	INFORMAL COMMUNICATIONS	41	21	21	8
14	WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS	49	27	11	8

[1] Percentages do not add up to 100% in some cases because of no response situations

15	BELOW ARE SOME SERVICES THAT MAY BE PROVIDED BY RESOURCE/SUPPORT SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL. IF YOU ARE SATISFIED, CIRCLE "1", IF NOT CIRCLE "2". IF NOT APPLICABLE, CIRCLE "0".	NOT APPLICABLE %	GENERALLY SATISFIED %	GENERALLY NOT SATISFIED %
	CONDUCTS WORKSHOPS	14	76	10
	CONDUCTS GROUP MEETINGS	6	84	10
	INFORMS YOU OF PROGRAM INFORMATION, DECISIONS, AND PROCEDURES	3	83	14
	LOCATES AVAILABLE RESOURCE MATERIALS	3	88	11
	ON-SITE CLASSROOM TRAINING	13	70	17
	GIVES SUPPORT TO INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS	5	81	14
	OFFERS SUPPORT IN WORKING WITH PARAPROFESSIONALS	8	79	13
	OFFERS SUPPORT IN PARENT INVOLVEMENT	11	70	19
	ARRANGES USE OF PROFESSIONAL DAYS	25	65	10
	GIVES SUPPORT IN WORKING OUT CONCERNS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN	3	81	16
	GIVES SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVE USE OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS	3	83	14
	GIVES SUPPORT IN SOLVING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS	3	78	19

16	INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FELT THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT YOU RECEIVED THIS YEAR HELPED YOU DO A BETTER JOB IN YOUR CLASSROOM. IF NOT APPLICABLE, CIRCLE "0".				
	AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	NOT APPLICABLE	EXTENT OF CHANGE		
			LITTLE	MODERATE	GREAT
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	19	24	38	17
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	24	24	40	13
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	19	25	32	24
	CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	24	17	44	14
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	25	22	35	16
	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	10	25	37	27
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	11	27	37	25
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	19	16	40	24
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	17	22	33	25
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	22	25	32	21
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	14	27	35	22
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	19	27	32	21
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	10	27	40	24
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	17	30	40	10
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	44	30	21	5
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	27	22	33	17
	SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	10	22	37	30
	USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	8	30	30	32

17	FROM THE LIST BELOW OF AREAS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT SELECT THE FIVE YOU PREFER MOST BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN	
	AREAS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	PREFERRED "FIVE" %
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	48
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	27
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	43
	GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	13
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	13
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	27
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	30
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	10
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	5
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	48
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	14
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	41
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	49
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	13
	INTEGRATION	13
	SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	22
	USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	21
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	22
18	INDICATE BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN, THOSE AREAS IN WHICH YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT. (AFTER SCHOOL HOURS)	
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	25
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	17
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	25
	GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	13
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	13
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	21
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	16
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	6
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	11
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	24
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	5
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	19
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	19
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	19
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	14
	SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	16
	USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	16

EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT
STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH
AIDE (N=53)

(1) LOG NUMBER

OFFICE USE ONLY

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to continue documentation of the types, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of various staff development sessions across several early childhood programs.

The intent is to determine the range and extent of staff development available through the combined efforts of all personnel responsible for staff development (such as supervisory, resource, and support personnel) in each program.

Staff Development is considered to consist of all activities which lead to professional growth, including workshops, consultations, conferences, on-site visitations, meetings, newsletters, demonstrations, and informal discussions.

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number following each question. You may enter comments on page 4. Items numbered 2 and 3 will be precoded for your convenience.

We very much appreciate the time you are spending in completing this information.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2 PROGRAM

ACADEMICS PLUS	1
BARC	2
BRIDGE	3
CHECKPOINT	4
CHILD CARE	5
DURHAM INFANT TODDLER	6
FOLLOW THROUGH	7
FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION	8
GET SET DAY CARE	9
PRESCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT (BROWN)	10
PRE-K HEAD START	11
PARENT CO-OP NURSERIES	12
POWELTON MANTUA PROGRAM	13
PRIMARY SKILLS	14
REGULAR KINDERGARTEN	15

3 MODEL/OPTION UTILIZED IN YOUR SCHOOL/CENTER

BANK STREET	1
BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS	2
BILINGUAL BICULTURAL	3
EDC	4
MONTESSORI	5
OPEN CLASSROOM	6
PARENT IMPLEMENTED	7
PHILADELPHIA PROCESS	8
RESPONSIVE LEARNING	9
OPTION 1 EXPANSION	10
OPTION 2 EXPANSION	11
OPTION 4 EXPANSION	12
OPTION 5 EXPANSION	13
OPTION 1 PRIMARY SKILLS	14
OPTION 4 PRIMARY SKILLS	15
NOT APPLICABLE	16

4 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW MUCH EARLY CHILDHOOD (PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 4) CLASSROOM OR CENTER EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD?

		%[1]
0 - 4 MONTHS	1	2
5 - 8 MONTHS	2	0
1 - 2 YEARS	3	0
3 - 5 YEARS	4	5
6 -10 YEARS	5	53
OVER 10 YEARS	6	40

5 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WITH YOUR PRESENT PROGRAM?

		%
0 - 4 MONTHS	1	4
5 - 8 MONTHS	2	4
1 - 2 YEARS	3	0
3 - 5 YEARS	4	6
6 -10 YEARS	5	57
OVER 10 YEARS	6	28

6 INDICATE YOUR PRESENT POSITION:

TEACHER	1
ASSISTANT TEACHER	2
AIDE	3

	WORKSHOPS (i.e., FORMAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT SESSIONS)	% 1-5	% 6-10	% OVER 10	% NONE
7	HOW MANY WORKSHOPS HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS YEAR?	17	32	40	6
8	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY YOUR PROGRAM?	17	32	40	4
9	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT?	29	9	6	28
	CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATION	1-5	6-10	OVER 10	NONE
10	HOW MANY CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS HAVE YOU HAD THIS YEAR?	49	19	17	4
	ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS	1-15	16-30	OVER 30	NONE
11	GROUP MEETINGS	45	25	11	6
12	INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES	57	17	13	2
13	INFORMAL COMMUNICATIONS	57	11	17	6
14	WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS	43	9	21	6

[1] Percentages do not add up to 100% in some cases because of no response situations

15	BELOW ARE SOME SERVICES THAT MAY BE PROVIDED BY RESOURCE/SUPPORT SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL. IF YOU ARE SATISFIED, CIRCLE "1", IF NOT CIRCLE "2". IF NOT APPLICABLE, CIRCLE "0".	NOT APPLICABLE %	GENERALLY SATISFIED %	GENERALLY NOT SATISFIED %
	CONDUCTS WORKSHOPS	6	92	2
	CONDUCTS GROUP MEETINGS	6	89	6
	INFORMS YOU OF PROGRAM INFORMATION, DECISIONS, AND PROCEDURES	2	96	2
	LOCATES AVAILABLE RESOURCE MATERIALS	4	92	4
	ON-SITE CLASSROOM TRAINING	15	81	4
	GIVES SUPPORT TO INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS	0	98	2
	OFFERS SUPPORT IN WORKING WITH PARAPROFESSIONALS	11	87	2
	OFFERS SUPPORT IN PARENT INVOLVEMENT	13	85	2
	ARRANGES USE OF PROFESSIONAL DAYS	21	74	6
	GIVES SUPPORT IN WORKING OUT CONCERNS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN	6	92	2
	GIVES SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVE USE OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS	6	91	4
	GIVES SUPPORT IN SOLVING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS	13	83	4

16	INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FELT THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT YOU RECEIVED THIS YEAR HELPED YOU DO A BETTER JOB IN YOUR CLASSROOM. IF NOT APPLICABLE, CIRCLE "0".				
	AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	NOT APPLICABLE	EXTENT OF CHANGE		
			LITTLE	MODERATE	GREAT
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	11	9	57	23
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	21	6	45	26
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	13	17	47	21
	CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	17	9	49	23
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	17	21	43	17
	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	9	13	55	23
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	15	11	43	26
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	21	11	34	32
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	26	11	45	17
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	13	15	30	40
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	6	11	40	40
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	17	15	40	26
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	9	11	40	38
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	19	19	38	25
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	32	26	30	6
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	19	19	38	21
	SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	6	9	34	47
	USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	25	4	17	47

17	FROM THE LIST BELOW OF AREAS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT SELECT THE FIVE YOU PREFER MOST BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN	
	AREAS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	PREFERRED "FIVE" %
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	40
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	29
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	45
	GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	9
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	11
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMEN	36
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	9
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	21
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	29
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	49
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	6
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	38
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	43
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	23
	INTEGRATION	9
	SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	34
	USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	29
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	19

18	INDICATE BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPRORRIATE COLUMN, THOSE AREAS IN WHICH YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT. (AFTER SCHOOL HOURS)	
		%
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	17
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	13
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	26
	GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	11
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	2
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	21
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	9
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	9
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	25
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	26
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	6
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	19
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	36
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	15
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	11
	SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	19
	USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	25

APPENDIX D

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT

PARENT INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE SY 1978-1979

OFFICE USE

NOTE: Questions on completion of this form will be answered by John McKinney, Tel: 299-7766.

1. IDENTIFICATION: Name of School or Center_____ Program_____

Name of Person(s) Completing Questionnaire_____ Phone_____

2. DESIGNATION OF PARENT GROUP: Is a program-specific parent group (such as the Follow Through Parent Advisory Council) in operation at the school or center level?

YES [X] 100% NO [ ]

If the response to the above is NO, which one of the following is the main parent group that program parents are involved in at the school or center level? (Please mark only one response)

Home and School Association [ ]

Title I Parent School Committee [ ]

Kindergarten-Counselor Project [ ]

3. FUNCTIONS OF PARENT GROUP: In the meetings of the parent group (the one designated above), indicate the amount of time spent on the following subjects: (please mark only one response to each subject)

		Little or None =1	Moderate =2	A Great Deal =3
Providing input for policy and budget decisions.	2.50	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Planning extracurricular activities for the children (for example, class trips).	2.00	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Planning educational sessions for the parent group.	2.42	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Planning fund-raising events.	2.64	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Planning social activities.	2.14	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Other_____ (please specify)	.50	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

4. PARTCIPATION OF COMMUNITY GROUPS: Did any community groups work with committees of the parent group designated above, or involve themselves in classroom activities during the school year?

YES [X] NO [ ] If yes, name the community group(s) and what they did_____

10 Sites (71%)

5. NUMBER OF PARENTS: Indicate the number of families whose children attend the program at your school or center. 2,374

Continued

6. EXTENT OF VOLUNTEER WORK: Please indicate below the number of parents volunteering for the listed activities and the number of hours contributed.

a. In counting the 'Number of Parents Volunteering' for each 'Type Activity' count each parent volunteer only once. For example, Mrs Smith would be counted as a volunteer for 'Class trip participation' only once even if she partcipated in four different trips.

b. The 'Number of Hours Contributed' for each 'Type Activity' is shown by this example where there have been two class trips during the year: 4 parents went on the first trip which lasted 3 hours, and 6 parents went on the second trip that lasted 5 hours. The 'Number of Hours Contributed' would be 42 (4 x 3 = 12 for the first trip, 6 x 5 = 30 for the second trip; 12 + 30 = 42 hours in all).

Type Activity	Number of Parents Volunteering N	Number of Parents Volunteering %	Number of Hours Contributed	No. of Hours Per Family
Administrative/clerical work perfromed at the school or center (for example, mimeographing)	51	2.14	1,072	0.45
Classroom participation	422	17.77	16,704	7.03
Class trip partcipation	205	8.63	1,077	0.45
Work done at home (for example, baking, costumes)	342	14.40	1,419	0.59
Work done at fund-raising events	220	9.26	1,446	0.60
Other _____ (please specify)	97	4.08	2,290	0.96

7. PARENT WORKSHOPS: This item is concerned with the parent workshops that were attended by parents from your center. For each workshop enter the number of parents that attended and the length of time in hours that the workshop lasted. Enter the information in the 'ATTEND HRS' boxes under the suitable type of workshop column, using as many boxes as necessary. The example on the right shows what entries would be made if there had been three workshops of a certain type with 20 parents attending the first lasting 4 hours, 15 parents the second lasting 2 hours, and 5 parents the third lasting 6 hours.

EXAMPLE:

ATTEND	HRS
20	4
15	2
5	6

PARENT INVQLVEMENT WORKSHOP DATA

TYPE WKSHP	MAN-HOURS	N of WKSHP	ATTENDANCE	WKSHP HRS
Educational	4,626	88	1,368	292
Pol Planning	1,899	71	594	228
Soc Svc.	340	25	220	41
H & Nuitrition	230	14	143	24
Careers; Job Training	20	1	10	2
Personal Growth & Development	1,126	18	369	53
Other	1,740	26	350	178
TOTALS	9,981	243	3,054	818
PER SITE	- - - - -	17.35	- - - - -	58.42
PER FAM	4.20	- - - - -	1.28	- - - - -

APPENDIX E

TABLE I
ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH
HEALTH SERVICES

PROGRAM* ENROLLMENT		EPSDT ELIGIBLE		PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS		COMPLETED SCREENINGS							
						VISION		HEARING		GROWTH		DENTAL	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2657	100	268	10	715	27	1662	63	1487	56	1333	50	1781	67

* Program enrollment was based on the enrollment figure as of the end of March, 1979.

Based on data obtained from the Division of School Health Services, 715 (27%) of the children had physical examinations, 1662 (63%) had vision screening, 1487 (56%) had hearing screenings, 1333 (50%) had growth screenings, and 1781 (67%) had dental screenings. Table 2 shows the number of medical problems found, the number referred and the number of problems that were either under care of physicians or care was completed.

TABLE 2

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS (Medical Examinations)

PROVIDER	FOUND THROUGH EXAMINATIONS	REFERRED		UNDER CARE OR CARE COMPLETED	
	N	N	%	N	%
Private Physicians	89	84	94	76	90
School Physicians	143	122	85	46	38
TOTAL	232	206	89	122	59

A total of 232 medical problems were identified of which 206 (89%) were referred. One hundred and twenty-two (59%) of the total problems referred were either "under care" or care was completed.

The data in Table 3 indicate that 259 vision problems, 69 hearing problems and 111 growth problems were identified. Of the 259 visual problems -- 204 (79%) were referred and 89 (44%) were either under care or care was completed, of the 69 hearing problems -- 67 (91%) were referred and 32 (48%) were either under care or care was completed and of the 111 growth problems -- 82 (74%) were referred and 54 (66%) were under care or care was completed. Available data on dental services indicate that 162 children received treatment.

TABLE 3

Identified Problems

PROBLEMS	FOUND THROUGH SCREENINGS	REFERRED		UNDER CARE OR CARE COMPLETED	
	N	N	%	N	%
VISION	259	204	79	89	44
HEARING	69	67	97	32	48
GROWTH	111	82	74	54	66
DENTAL	NR*	NR		162**	

* NR = not reported

** Dental reports were received from 6 of the 14 Original Follow Through Schools.

TABLE 4

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH 1978-1979

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES[1]

SCHOOLS	HOURS	NUMBER AND TYPES OF MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES								
		DIRECT SERVICES					INDIRECT SERVICES			
		CHILDREN		FACULTY & OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL	PARENTS	CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	FACULTY & PLANNING MEETINGS	PARENT EDUCATION	REFERRALS
		OBSERVATION/ SCREENING	COUNSELING/ THERAPY							
A	51.0	20	0	9	3	0	1	1	0	0
B	47.5	11	4	14	1	1	0	1	0	0
C	105.0	26	18	20	13	0	1	4	1	7
D	28.0	9	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	0
E	47.0	20	0	7	0	0	4	0	0	0
F-I	NI[2]	20	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	10	1	0	N.I.
TOTAL	278.5	106	26	51	17	1	16	8	1	7

[1]The number of schools reported in table represents the 8 of 14 Follow Through Schools which contracted mental health services

[2]N.I. = No information was made available

APPENDIX F

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH

SOCIAL SERVICES

A total of 2,285 families with approximately 2,657 children participated in the program's 14 schools during the 10 months of recorded services. Parent Involvement Coordinators (PICs) identified 1,115 (48.8%) families which required their services. Services were provided to 946 (84.8%) of the families requiring services. See Table I.

PICs made 19,926 contacts of which 10,647 (53.4%) were with families, 3,014 (15.1%) were with program staff and 3,549 (17.8%) were with the community agencies. The remaining 2,716 (13.6%) were not identified by the PICs. See Table II.

Overall, the contacts were conducted for the purpose of child's attendance including adjustment to the center (25.5%), child's physical health including mental health (25.4%), sharing program information with the families (20.2%), sharing information about the community resources (6%), intake-termination process and recruitment (5.8%) and parents' employment, training, education or illness (3%). See Table III.

ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH, 1978-1979
SOCIAL SERVICES

PROGRAM _____ SITE _____ SOCIAL SERVICES WORKER _____ Period _____ Date _____

1a) 2,285 / 2657 Families/Children — How many families and children participated in the program. Include those who have left the program during the (month) quarter.

b) 582 / 709 Families/Children — How many families and children left the program this (month) quarter?

2) 1,039 — How many families did you contact this (month) quarter to follow-up on a service need which you had dealt with in a prior period

3a) 1,115 — How many families did you identify as needing assistance of a social services nature this (month) quarter (e.g., assistance in using community agencies)? DO NOT INCLUDE FAMILIES whom you have previously identified under Question 2 (above).

b) 946 — Of this number, how many families were assisted this (month) quarter?

4) Please indicate the number and types of contacts with all families in the chart below:

Purpose of Contacts	TYPES OF CONTACTS: Setting of Contacts with Parents			Contacts with Community Agencies & Program Personnel					Total	%
	Contacts by Phone Only	Home Visits	Conferences at School or Site	Sharing/Exhg. Information w/ Community Ags.	Referrals	Acting on Child/Adult's Behalf	Conferences w/ Program Personnel	Other (e.g., Counseling, letters)		
Classroom Attendance Behavior of Child	909	1,493	392	112	768	304	994	114	5,086	25.52
Health Services for Child (Med/Den/Nutr.)	794	1,227	303	246	581	229	628	339	4,347	21.82
Mental Health Services for Child	56	283	56	42	41	31	180	38	727	3.65
Progress Report of Child	234	509	140	33	146	45	232	157	1,496	7.51
Sharing Program Information with family	619	811	375	124	103	58	220	1,730	4,040	20.28
Sharing Information About Community Ags.	302	313	169	86	113	57	123	49	1,212	6.08
Parent's Employment/ Trg./Education/Illness	93	78	176	39	33	42	108	33	602	3.02
Intake-Termination Process & Recruitment	195	271	149	70	61	59	178	181	1,164	5.84
Other	226	318	156	38	58	30	351	75	1,252	6.28
Total	3,428	5,303	1,916	790	1,904	855	3,014	2,716	19,926	

5) 1,576 — Of the home visits you made this (month) quarter, please indicate the number of families you visited for the first time this 1978-1979 school year.

COMMENTS:

F-2

57

58